

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 6 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement and objected to the disclosure. The Examiner further objected to claims 5 and 10. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicants' alleged admitted prior art and rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' alleged admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa et al. ("A Data-Driven Implementation of Telecommunication Network Systems"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner indicated that Japanese document A6-83731 dated March 25, 1994, would not be considered by the Examiner, asserting no translation of the Abstract of this document was provided. As evidenced by the IDS Transmittal Letter, it is respectfully submitted that this Japanese document was submitted with an English language Abstract. In further support of this statement, Applicants submit herewith a stamped copy of the postcard receipt. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants submit herewith a duplicate copy of the Abstract of the Japanese document together with an

additional copy of the Form PTO-1449 filed on May 2, 2001. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider this document accordingly.

### **Specification**

The Examiner objected to the Abstract, asserting it does not provide a sufficient description of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that MPEP § 608.01(b), citing to 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b) recites "a brief abstract of the technical disclosure in the specification must commence on a separate sheet, preferably following the claims, under the heading 'Abstract' or 'Abstract of the Disclosure.' . . . The purpose of the Abstract is to enable the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the public generally to determine quickly from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure. The Abstract will not be used for interpreting the scope of the claims." It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertion that the Abstract does not provide a sufficient description of the claimed invention is erroneous. The rules require that the Abstract be directed to the technical disclosure. It is respectfully submitted that the Abstract as currently recited in the present specification is directed, as required under MPEP § 608.01(b), to the Abstract of the Disclosure. As such, it is respectfully requested that outstanding objection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the disclosure in paragraph 5, Applicants have amended the disclosure as suggested by the Examiner in items 1-3 and 5-6. Based upon these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding objection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner's objection in item 4, Applicants respectfully submit the following. Referring to Fig. 4, a junction unit 15a of M inputs and 1 output is illustrated. Page 17, lines 24-25 of the specification provides that (M-1) junction units, each junction unit based on 2 inputs and 1 output, are provided as a configuration in the embodiment of the present invention. As one specific example, if junction unit 15a is to establish 1 output for 2(=M) inputs, one junction unit, i.e., a single 2 input, 1-output junction unit is provided. Similarly, if junction unit 15a is to establish 1 output for 3 (=M) inputs, two junction units, i.e., 2 input, 1-output junction units are provided. Thus, if junction unit 15a is to establish 1 output for M inputs (M-1) of 2-input 1-output junction units are provided. Based upon the above, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding objection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the title, by this Amendment, Applicants have amended the title as suggested by the Examiner. Based upon this amendment, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding objection be withdrawn.

### Claim Objections

With regard to the Examiner's objection to claims 5 and 10, Applicants have amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner for grammatical purposes. Based upon these amendments, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding objection be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 6 to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, a method of controlling execution of a data driven type information processing apparatus wherein a transfer rate used in the self-synchronous transfer control circuit of the router is set so as to be greater than the maximum transfer rate that can be used in the data driven type information processing apparatus, based on the maximum transfer rate.

It is respectfully submitted that the Applicants' admitted prior art provides on pages 9 and 10 as follows:

Fig. 19 is a block diagram showing a 2 x 2 router with a small circuit scale. Referring to Fig. 19, the router is formed by one of the branching units shown in Fig. 14 and one of the junction units shown in Fig. 16, and there is one path 11c from junction unit 11a to branching unit 11b. Here, at the one path 11c, the data input from IN1 and IN2 at the maximum transfer rate are joined. As the transfer rate of the

path 11c is the same maximum transfer rate, when the data input at the maximum transfer rate are joined, the processing capacity is overloaded. As a result, in the configuration of the router shown in Fig. 19, input is possible only at such a transfer rates in that the sum of the transfer rates of the inputs from IN1 and IN2 is equal to or lower than the maximum transfer rate.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Applicants' alleged admitted prior art that is directed to the method wherein the transfer rate used in the self-synchronous transfer control circuit of the router is set so as to be greater than the maximum transfer rate that can be used in the data driven type information processing apparatus. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 contains elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and, thus, claim 6, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

#### Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview

in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a). A check in the amount of \$110.00 in payment of the extension of time fee is attached.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By  *Rec # 52587*

*for* Charles Gorenstein, #29,271

  
CG/CMV/jdm  
0033-0720P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s): English language abstract of JP 06-083731  
Copy of Form PTO-1449 dated May 2, 2001  
Copy of stamped postcard receipt dated May 2, 2001

(Rev. 02/12/2004)